

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

WILLIAM REEVES CATHEY,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
)	CIV-14-1036-D
v.)	
)	
OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT)	
OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner, a state prisoner appearing *pro se*, filed this action on September 25, 2014, seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The matter has been referred by United States District Judge DeGiusti to the undersigned Magistrate Judge for initial proceedings consistent with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). On September 30, 2014, the undersigned reviewed the pleadings filed by Petitioner and entered an Order notifying Petitioner that the documents filed on September 25, 2014, were deficient because the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* was not submitted and/or the \$5 filing fee had not been paid and the Petition was not on the proper 28 U.S.C. §2241 form. Petitioner was directed to cure this deficiencies on or before October 20, 2014. The Petitioner was further cautioned that the undersigned would recommend that the action be dismissed without prejudice if the

Petitioner failed to comply. As of this date, Petitioner has failed to cure the deficiencies by either submitting an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* that complies with 28 U.S.C. §1915 and Local Civil Rule 3.3 or paying the \$5.00 filing fee and filing the Petition on the proper form.

Petitioner's lack of interest in complying with the Court's Order combined with the Court's attempt to manage and control its caseload warrant a dismissal of the action without prejudice. Brandenburg v. Beaman, 632 F.2d 120, 122 (10th Cir. 1980) (*per curiam*), cert. denied, 450 U.S. 984 (1981).

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that the Petition be dismissed without prejudice. The Petitioner is advised of his right to file an objection to the Report and Recommendation with the Clerk of this Court by November 19th, 2014, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. The failure to timely object to this Report and Recommendation would waive appellate review of the recommended ruling. Moore v. United States of America, 950 F.2d 656 (10th Cir. 1991); cf. Marshall v. Chater, 75 F.3d 1421, 1426 (10th Cir. 1996) (“Issues raised for the first time in objections to the magistrate judge’s recommendations are deemed waived.”).

This Report and Recommendation disposes of all issues referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge in the captioned matter, and any pending motion not specifically addressed herein is denied.

ENTERED this 30th day of October, 2014.


GARY M. PURCELL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE